

REMARKS

Claims 1-15 are pending in the above-identified application. Claims 1-15 were rejected. With this Amendment, claims 16-17 were added. Accordingly, claims 1-17 are at issue in the above-identified application.

35 U.S.C. § 102 Anticipation Rejection of Claims

Claims 1-15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by *Greg Kisor* (U.S. Patent No. 6,098,091). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claim 1 recites that the registered information characterizing said pieces of terminal equipment includes "information identifying equipment types and functional characteristics of said pieces of terminal equipment." The Examiner assert that *Kisor* discloses this feature at col. 3, lines 19-44. Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Kisor teaches a method and system for assigning tasks to computers connected via a wide area network. In particular, the *Kisor* system includes a central computer and one or more remote computers. The central computer polls each remote computer as to its availability and its computational capabilities. The central computer then assigns tasks to available idle computers for processing. At col. 3, lines 19-44, *Kisor* simply states that the remote computers may be a variety of different types of computers from different vendors such as an IBM computer, an Apple computer, or a Sun workstation. Nonetheless, each piece of equipment in *Kisor* is still a computer, and thus the same type of equipment. Accordingly, the *Kisor* system does not disclose information identifying equipment types.

The present invention, by contrast, relates to a communication system, an information controller, a network system, and a variety of terminal equipment. The terminal equipment may be, as further recited in new claims 16 and 17, a computer **35** and **53**, a printer **36** and **54**, a television **32**, an audio reproducing system **34**, a video tape recording system **33**, a facsimile machine/telephone **37**, or any other resource that a user may access, and communicate information with, via a computer network. See e.g. Fig. 1; Spec., 6:3-10, 13-19¹. Thus, the registered information, as recited in claim 1, includes information identifying a type of equipment for the pieces of terminal equipment in the system.

Moreover, even if computers from different vendors were different types of equipment (which they are not), *Kisor* still fails to teach or even suggest that any such information is registered in an information control means. *Kisor* teaches that the central computer "periodically polls remote systems 28 regarding the time of day when the remote systems will be available to operate in a contractor relationship and the resources available 224 on the remote system 208." (Col. 4, lines 37-41). Thus, in *Kisor*, only information regarding the functionality of the remote system is transmitted, not information relating to the equipment type. In fact, since the system in *Kisor* assumes that every piece of equipment is a computer, there would be no need for *Kisor* to transmit information regarding the type of equipment since the only relevant information for the *Kisor* system is when the remote computer is available and what computing resources it has available at that time.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that claim 1, as well as dependent claim 2 is allowable over the cited art. For the same reasons, Applicants submit that claims 3-17 are also allowable over the cited art.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants submit that the application is in condition for allowance. Notice to that effect is requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: May 4, 2006

By: /David R. Metzger/
David R. Metzger
Registration No. 32,919
SONNENSCHNEIN NATH & ROSENTHAL LLP
P.O. Box 061080
Wacker Drive Station, Sears Tower
Chicago, Illinois 60606-1080
(312) 876-8000